DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 796 HE 030 689

AUTHOR Gullatt, David E.; Weaver, Sue Wells
TITLE Use of Faculty Development Activities To Improve the Effectiveness of U.S. Institutions of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 1997-10-16
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (22nd, Hines City, FL, October 16-19, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activities; College Instruction; *Colleges; *Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Financial Support; Grants; Higher Education; Meetings; National Surveys; Portfolios (Background Materials); *School Effectiveness; Statistical Analysis; Technology; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS Retreats

ABSTRACT

This study examined the use of faculty development activities to improve the effectiveness of colleges and universities in the United States. A total of 116 institutions in 45 states responded to a mailed survey questionnaire on faculty development activities. It was found that all responding institutions included a faculty development component within their institutional effectiveness efforts, and that most institutions used guest speakers, informal "brown bag" gatherings, on-campus faculty development centers, or retreats to provide faculty development. Topics most often addressed in faculty development programs included technology enhancement, new theories of teaching and learning, grant writing, institutional faculty evaluation processes, and teaching portfolios. Funding for these activities comes from numerous sources, with the institution's general budget the most common source. The results indicated that more faculty development centers and more frequent faculty development activities were found on campuses having larger institutional operating budgets. (Contains 54 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 414 796

Use of Faculty Development Activities to Improve the Effectiveness of U. S. Institutions of Higher Education

a paper presented at the

22nd Annual Conference of the

Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Eduation

held in Hines City, Florida

on October 16-19, 1997

by

David E. Gullatt, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership

College of Education

and

Sue Wells Weaver, Ph.D.

Dean, The General College

Northwestern State University of Louisiana

Natchitoches, LA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David E. Gullatt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Extensive research in the areas of faculty productivity and institutional effectiveness has failed to produce commonly accepted measures quantifying the constructs. Research in faculty productivity centers on three broad areas of activity--teaching, research, and service. Institutional effectiveness research focuses on procedures for institutional improvement such as increasing the efficiency of institutional program delivery.

At present, there is no identified mechanism for ensuring accountability to higher education's fiscal supporters based on faculty productivity or institutional effectiveness. The traditional independent governance of each American college/university campus has resulted in the development of site-specific sets of productivity measures that serve only the internal evaluation needs of the particular institution. However, accrediting associations are beginning to implement changes which address the effectiveness issue.

This article summarizes the faculty development initiatives presently addressing institutional effectiveness and faculty productivity in U.S. institutions of higher education. The number, type, organization, and funding of faculty development efforts are analyzed. Additionally, to further specify findings, research data is categorized by accreditation region, institutional enrollment, operating budget, academic division, and method of funding.

This synthesis of existing knowledge is useful for universities involved in on-going academic development, planning, and budgeting. It may also help in fulfillment of accountability mandates of state legislative and policy-making agreements.

USE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF U.S. INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The Change in Role of Higher Education

Traditionally higher education enjoyed a great deal of respect and freedom. It was one of the few professional entities, for example, that regulated itself and had no external certification for its professional staff. This distinction was the result of four factors. First, a college education was considered important primarily for the intellectually and socially elite. Second, the intellectual activities of colleges were perceived to be mysterious and beyond the understanding of the average person. Third, while it was fashionable for a community to have a college, its size and demand on the public dollar were small. Fourth and perhaps the most important, colleges along with churches were considered the moral leaders of society (Wilcox & Ebbs, 1992).

Over the years, higher education's role of leadership has changed considerably. Higher education is now considered one of the most important social institutions in our society for many good reasons. It has helped lead the world in research, as evidenced by the number of its Nobel laureates. Also almost all professions require some form of higher education for qualification or certification; and, as indicated by employment statistics, a college education is almost mandatory for a high paying job.

Today, with higher education more expensive and dollars from public and private funding sources more scarce, institutions are becoming more aware of the importance of fiscal responsibility. Budgets are being scrutinized and programs are being defended on all fronts. Justification of existence through assessment results is common. Higher education

institutions are now measuring progress against some commonly held benchmark, most often an articulated mission or value system. Such activities had increased from 55% in 1980 to 67% in 1987. In 1990, 82% of all colleges reported such assessments under way (Wilcox & Ebbs, 1992). More recently, outcome assessments have been mandated as a form of self-analysis

Impetus for Professional Development

More sophisticated reporting systems will be required of twenty-first century American universities, for justifying the cost of higher education. Accountability reports, utilizing qualitative and quantitative measures of effectiveness, are mandated in most state legislatures. Institutional effectiveness, or how well or proficiently an institution achieves its stated goals, is becoming a cornerstone of regional accreditation reviews (Ewell, 1995). Lisensky (1994) states that institutional effectiveness is the larger umbrella that measures the productivity of the entire institution. The human resource dimension of institutional effectiveness is faculty productivity, which we may explore as accountability of the public tax dollar or the direct learning environment.

Bills addressing efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability in higher education were passed in Kentucky, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia (Southern Regional Education Board, 1996). A Kentucky task force is presently reviewing the Council of Higher Education's strategic plan, issues relating to performance funding, efficient and effective delivery of academic programs, and the use of new technologies. West Virginia increases funding to universities making progress toward meeting the goals and benchmarks in the state higher education strategic plan. South Carolina, the first state in

the nation to call for institutional funding to be based entirely on performance, gives the Commission on Higher Education responsibility for coordinating a plan to increase classroom and faculty quality. By fall 2000, the Commission is to develop and implement a performance-based funding formula using acceptable performance standards with specified indicators of success.

The Louisiana Legislature mandated higher education accountability in 1993 and reaffirmed the mandate in 1994. The Board of Regents' Master Plan for Higher Education of 1993 recommends a statewide faculty evaluation system. Neither set of recommendations has resulted in a plan or system at the state level; however, efforts are now aimed at some standardized system of institutional measurement by 1998.

Faculty productivity, along with other indicators of instructional and operational effectiveness, is being examined at Northwestern State University of Louisiana in an effort to improve academic vitality in the colleges, divisions, and departments. This initiative evolved from the university's self-study prior to accreditation review by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

As the mission of higher education institutions changes, so must the direction of (a)curriculum, (b) program delivery, (c) instructional delivery, and (d) evaluation of effectiveness. Faculty development is the vehicle by which higher education faculty may continually improve its efforts toward achieving the desired outcomes stated in its mission and objectives.

Research Purpose

Not enough is known about academic productivity and faculty development at the higher education level. There are no universally accepted measures of academic performance or faculty development. Nor are there universal measures to access the impact of faculty development on university instruction efforts (Cooper & Hensley, 1993a).

This study focuses on broad issues related to higher education faculty development, associating development with increased faculty productivity and institutional effectiveness. This research adds to the literature by including all institutions of higher education in the United States, whereas past studies centered only on large institutions. The present study contains data collected from institutions of various enrollments, operational budgets, and fund patterns. This survey of universities' faculty development procedures will produce data relative to faculty support and faculty productivity, with results that are reliable and generalizable across disciplines and universities.

This study provides information in response to the following questions: How do American institutions of higher education keep pace with the changing societal needs for services provided by their institutions? How are faculty kept abreast of the latest teaching procedures that will address the needs of the a changing student population? What are procedures used by U.S. institutions of higher education to encourage and further faculty professional development? How are these activities planned and funded? How are they evaluated for success?

Faculty Development

Higher education faculty development studies have begun to emerge. Diverse study foci include (a) learning effectiveness emphasizing the use of technology (Fitzgerald & Olsen, 1992); (b) test efficiency (Jacobsen, 1993; Broader & Dorfman, 1994); (c) instruction for non-traditional students (Clark & Lynch, 1992); and (d) teaching and learning styles (Kaplan & Kies, 1993). Comprehensive faculty development programs address such areas as (a) public service, (b) curriculum development, (c) career and personal development, and (d) research development (Fenton, 1990).

Research has been conducted on the importance of higher education faculty development in many areas needing improvement such as: (a) adjunct/part time faculty (McGuire, 1993), (b) faculty vitality (Chan & Burton, 1993), (c) distance delivery (Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, 1993), (d) technology enhancements to instructional delivery (Maryland State Council for Vocational-Technical Education, 1991), (e) faculty diversity (Checkoway, 1996), and (f) curriculum reform (Baxter, 1996). This study is an effort to survey universities regarding faculty development procedures and to develop from the data a pool of information regarding faculty support measures assisting faculty productivity that are reliable and generalizable across disciplines and universities.

Many colleges and universities are presently exploring strategies for establishing efficient and productive faculty professional development activities. No national standard is yet used to validate faculty productivity or faculty professional development activities within U.S. institutions of higher learning; however, Gullatt and Weaver (1996) found a

statistically significant relationship between institutional enrollment and professional development efforts. Larger universities reported more professional development activities.

One of the elusive and controversial issues in higher education is, "What makes a good college teacher?" In American education there is a marked gap between the preparation sequences experienced by elementary and secondary school teachers, on the one hand, and college teachers on the other (Osgood & York, 1992). Certification requirements for the former group demand immersion in pedagogical theory and practice. For the latter, there is no credential required other than a graduate or terminal degree in an academic discipline. Thus, professional development of higher education faculty has surfaced as a significant area of investigation in recent years with scholars such as Ernest Boyer, Alexander Astin, and Sylvia Grider highlighting the need for instructional and professional development improvement in higher education (Lowman, 1994). Strategies for communicating content to students need to be coupled with strategies for teaching students how to learn the content so that effective teachers not only present content with clarity but demonstrate the use of various metacognitive strategies (Weinstein & Meyer, 1991).

Faculty Productivity Research

Since the early 1900s there have been attempts to measure faculty productivity for university accountability. Birge studied equivalence of course loads in English and algebra, and Haggerty used clock hours rather than student contact hours (Cooper and

Hensley, 1993b). Lawler (1982) found that quantitative performance measures were acceptable to faculty, because public accountability was increasingly necessary.

Demographic variables of the academics have been identified, such as age (Lawrence & Blackburn, 1988) and several others (Garland & Rike, 1987, Konrad, 1991). Attitude variables also have been studied (Cooper & Hensley, 1993b). Faculty activities such as research publication, instruction, service and administration are common indicators of success, although quantification of achievement in these areas remains problematic (Cooper & Hensley, 1993a).

Attributes of the discipline and the university have also been much researched. Various instrumentation in these studies included the following: (a) faculty time and salaries (Jacobson, 1992a &1992b), (b) a collegiality model (Katula & Doody, 1990), (c) publication records (Wallace, 1990), (d) the technical thesis (DeYoung, 1985), and (e) various reporting systems (Cooper & Hensley, 1993b; Geuder, 1993; Heydinger & Simsek, 1992). The need for systematic faculty development strategies (Roever, 1990) and research collaboration (Elmes-Crahall, 1992) has also been investigated.

Faculty Development Research

In the past ten years there has been a change in the traditional bureaucracy in America. Businesses have begun to use a model of decision making that solicits employee suggestions and empowers employee groups to analyze their problems and to create solutions. The restructuring movement in education, which is intended to be a fundamental change rather than just a reform movement, encourages the same

decentralization of traditional authority and empowers faculty by giving them more voice in deciding how best to meet student needs (Little, 1986; Malughlin, 1991).

Consensus is emerging among researchers, professional development specialists, consultants, and key policy makers on ways to substantially increase the knowledge and skills of faculty (Hawley & Valli, 1996). This shared vision differs radically from current practice in colleges and universities. This new consensus about the essential characteristics of effective faculty development for higher education faculty calls for providing collegial opportunities to learn that are linked directly to solving authentic problems defined by the gaps between goals for student achievement and actual student performance (Hawley & Valli, 1996). This vision is the product of four diverging developments:

1. Research on higher education improvement that links change to faculty development.
2. Growing agreement that students should be expected to achieve much higher standards of performance, standards that include a capacity for complex and collaborative problem solving.
3. Research on learning and teaching that reaches conclusions substantially different from the theories about learning that have shaped contemporary strategies for instruction and assessment.
4. Research that confirms the widespread belief among educators that conventual

> strategies for faculty development are ineffective and wasteful and that provides for the adoption of different ways to facilitate professional learning. (p.1)

"Shallow" and "fragmented" are terms that critics commonly use to describe conventual approaches to faculty development. In the new view of faculty development, Collinson (1996) (and as cited in Hawley & Valli, 1996) sees eight aspects, all of which promote faculty inquiry rather than passive acceptance of ideas with little change reflected in instructional delivery.

> The new paradigm for faculty development is a shared, public process that promotes sustained interaction; emphasizes substantive, institutional-related issues; relies on internal expertise; expects faculty to be active participants; emphasizes the why as well as the "how" of instruction; articulates a theoretical research base; and anticipates that lasting change will be a slow process. (p. 1)

Characteristics of Effective Faculty Development

A review of the research (Hawley & Valli, 1996) has identified eight characteristics of effective faculty development. These eight "design principles" focus on faculty development strategies that seem essential to improving student learning over time. To be most effective, faculty development should follow these guidelines:

1. Be driven by analysis of the differences between (a) goals and standards for student learning and (b) student performance (Miller, Lord, & Dorney, 1994; Fullan, 1991). Such

analyses define what faculty need rather than what they want to learn, make faculty development student-centered, and provide evidence about the usefulness of alternative strategies for institutional improvement.

2. Involve learners (e.g., faculty) in identifying what they need to learn and, when possible, in developing the learning opportunity or process to be used (Little, 1993; Miller, Lord, & Dorney, 1994; Borko & Putnam, 1995). This engagement increases the motivation of the faculty to learn and makes it more likely that what is learned will be meaningful and relevant to particular contexts and problems.

3. Be primarily school-based and integral to institutional operations (Little, 1993; Guskey, 1995; Grossman, 1992; Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992). Providing faculty opportunities to recognize and solve authentic problems is often a powerful form of development.

4. Provide learning opportunities that relate to individual needs but are organized around collaborative problem solving (Little, 1993; Guskey, 1995; Huberman, 1995). Working together to address issues of common concern helps faculty identify both causes and potential solutions to problems. Through collaboration, higher education faculty can clarify learning needs and share knowledge and expertise.

5. Be continuous and ongoing, involving follow-up and support for further learning-including support from sources external to the institution (Miller, Lord, & Dorney, 1994; Guskey, 1995). As higher education institutions put into practice what their faculty has learned from faculty development, they often discover that they need to know more to be effective.

6. Encourage faculty to systematically evaluate the result of their efforts to apply what they have learned through development activities. The best evaluation involves analyzing multiple sources of information on both student outcomes and the implementation process (Tillema & Imants, 1995; Joyce & Showers, 1995).

7. Provide opportunities to engage in developing a theoretical understanding of the knowledge and skills to be learned (Borko & Putnam, 1995; Eraut, 1995). Virtually all educational ideas and practices need to be adapted to particular students and contexts. Such modification is more likely to be effective when it is informed by a theory in which the faculty member has confidence.

8. Be integrated with a comprehensive change process that deals with the impediments to, and facilitators of, student learning (Smylie, 1995, Guskey, 1995). For faculty development to be effective, what is learned must be practiced. Too often, faculty learn new things they can not act upon because there is no organizational commitment to continual experimentation and improvement.

Objectives of this Research

The specific objectives of this research were to investigate the following questions relating to higher education faculty development initiatives:

1. Do U. S. institutions of higher education utilize faculty development activities as a means to increase institutional effectiveness?
2. How do U. S. institutions of higher education accomplish faculty development?
3. What faculty development topics are addressed by U. S. institutions of higher education?

4. What procedures do U. S. institutions of higher education use to select and plan needed faculty development activities?

5. Do significant differences exist between (a) accreditation regions, (b) institutional enrollment, (c) institution operating budget, (d) academic division status, and (e) method of funding and:

   a. presence of a faculty development center on campus?

   b. staffing of faculty development centers on campus?

   c. frequency of faculty development activities?

   d. funding of faculty development activities and/or centers?

   e. planning process for developing faculty development activities?

6. How do U. S. institutions of higher education measure effectiveness of faculty development activities?

7. What methods are used by U. S. institutions of higher education to finance faculty development activities?

Methodology of Investigation

Two hundred twenty-five public and private U.S. institutions of higher education were selected at random from the 1994 list of members of the Association for Institutional Research (Association for Institutional Research, 1994). An institutional survey was mailed to the Director of Institutional Research for each selected school to determine procedures for faculty development used at that location. The institutional survey categorized the major components reflected in the literature concerning faculty development activities and referenced demographic characteristics of U. S. institutions of

higher education. The survey was refined by administrative and curriculum faculty at Northwestern State University of Louisiana. Changes were incorporated based on comments and suggestions received.

Responses from 116 institutions in 45 states, or 52% of the initial sample, returned surveys. The Pearson Chi-Square statistic was used to test associations identified in research question 5. The Yates correction for statistical significance was used when appropriate. A statistical analysis was conducted using MYSTAT (SYSTAT, 1990) desktop software. A relationship was considered significant at $p \leq .05$. Other data received were summarized in answer to the remaining research questions. Since the selection of study subjects was random, the research conclusions were generalizable to the national population of AIR institutions.

Description of the Population

All national accreditation regions are represented by the 116 responding institutions in the present study. Seventy-seven reporting institutions were public institutions and thirty-nine were private. Sixty institutions reported enrollment of less than 5,000 students while 24 reported enrollment between 5,000 and 10,000, 12 reported enrollment between 10,000 and 15,000 students, and 20 institutions reported enrollment above 15,000 students. In addition, 45 institutions reported an operating budget of $25 million or less, 45 reported operating budgets between $25 million and $40 million, and 26 institutions reported budgets of over $40 million. Last, 28 respondents were Doctoral I or II institutions, 36 institutions were master's/specialist institutions, 29 institutions were undergraduate-only, and 23 were community or junior colleges .

Findings of the Research

Research Question 1: Do U. S. institutions of higher education utilize faculty development activities as a means to increase institutional effectiveness?

All one hundred sixteen responding institutions reported including a faculty development component(s) within their institutional effectiveness efforts. Some institutions reported faculty development initiatives addressing one specific issue while other institutions utilized faculty development as a means to address two, three, or even more issues influencing institutional effectiveness.

Research Question 2: How do U. S. institutions of higher education accomplish faculty development?

Most responding institutions reported using 3 or 4 strategies to achieve faculty development on their campuses (see Table 1 for percentages). The average was 3.5 different faculty development designs or approaches per institution. Eighty-six institutions reported devoting time to faculty development described as a guest consultant/speaker addressing a single issue at a voluntarily attended campus-wide faculty meeting. Seventy-seven institutions reported utilizing informal "brown bag" gatherings for professional development. Institutions encouraging this type of faculty development effort reported that faculty members voluntarily met at various times during the school year, and professional development activities addressed a variety of on-campus issues. Faculty development efforts within colleges/divisions/departments were reported by 70 institutions which required faculty attendance. Fifty-six institutions reported faculty development efforts centered about consultants addressing multiple issues with voluntary

faculty attendance. The use of either on-campus faculty development centers and/or master teachers was reported by 48 institutions. Retreats were used by 53 institutions, with 30 institutions allowing voluntary faculty attendance and 23 institutions requiring faculty attendance. Finally, it was noted that only 15 institutions reported the requiring of faculty attendance at campus-wide faculty development activities whether the activities involved single or multiple issues.

Table 1

U. S. Higher Education Faculty Development Initiatives

Organizational Model	Institutions (N=116)	Percent
Campus-wide, single issue, voluntary attendance	86	74
Informal brown bag gatherings, voluntary attendance	77	67
College/division/department, single issue, required attendance	70	61
Campus-wide, multiple issues, voluntary attendance	56	49
Referrals to on-campus professional development centers	48	42
Faculty retreats, voluntary attendance	30	26
Faculty retreats, required attendance	23	20
Campus-wide, single issue, required attendance	10	8
Campus-wide, multiple issues, required attendance	5	4

Forty-eight institutions reported the use of either a campus-wide faculty development center or the use of master teachers or curriculum experts to assist with faculty development. Sixteen institutions reported using a full time, staffed center

available for all faculty members, and 14 institutions reported the use of a part time center serving all faculty members (see Table 2 for percents). Nine institutions reported funding part time centers within certain colleges/divisions/departments serving the faculty development needs of that particular sector, and 4 institutions reported full time faculty development centers within these areas. Another five institutions reported the use of master teachers or curriculum experts to assist with needed campus-wide faculty development. These faculty members were housed in their respective colleges/divisions/departments and were available as resource persons as needed by other faculty members from the same or other disciplines.

Table 2

U. S. Higher Education Faculty Development Centers/Curriculum Assistance

Organizational Scheme	Institutions (N=48)	Percent
Full time institutional center available for all faculty	16	33
Part time institutional center available for all faculty	14	29
Part time center within a specific college/division/department	9	19
Campus-wide master teacher/curriculum specialist program	5	10
Full time center within a specific college/division/department	4	8

Research Question 3: What faculty development topics are addressed by U. S. institutions of higher education?

Most responding institutions reported addressing 3-5 faculty development topics per school term. The average number per institution was 4.3. The most often addressed

higher education faculty development topics included: (a) technology enhancement efforts (92), (b) new theories of teaching and learning (79), (c) applying for grants and other external funding (67), (d) institutional faculty evaluation process (64), and (e) teaching portfolios (58) (see Table 3 for percentages). The five least reported topics reported were: (a) test construction and other student evaluation issues (35), (b) preparation of faculty lesson plans (29), (c) institutional service opportunities (24), (d) publishing techniques (23), and (e) research methodology (22).

Table 3

U. S. Higher Education Faculty Development Topics

Selected Topic	Institutions (N=116)	Percent
Technology enhancement (Instruction and Delivery)	92	80
New theories of teaching and learning	79	69
Applying for grants and other external funding	67	58
Institutional faculty evaluation process	64	56
Teaching portfolios	58	50
Test construction & student evaluation	35	30
Preparation of lesson plans	29	25
Institutional service opportunities	24	21
Publishing techniques	23	20
Research methodology	22	19

Research Question 4: What procedures do U. S. institutions of higher education use to select and plan needed faculty development activities?

Forty responding institutions reported that faculty development activities were selected and planned by faculty committees (see Table 4 for percentages). Other institutional decision making groups selecting faculty development activities included: (a) joint committee of faculty and administration (29), (b) institutional needs assessment instrument (24), and (c) administrative committee (17). The least used procedure for faculty development topic section included the use of a private consultant (6).

Table 4

U. S. Higher Education Faculty Development Activity Planning

Institutional Planning Mechanism	Institutions (N=116)	Percent
Faculty committee	40	34
Joint faculty-administrative committee	29	25
Needs assessment instrument	24	21
Administrative committee	17	15
Private consultant	6	5

Research Question 5: Do significant differences exist between (a) accreditation regions, (b) institutional enrollment, (c) institution operating budget, (d) academic division status, and (e) method of funding and:

a. presence of a faculty development center on campus?

b. staffing of faculty development centers on campus?

c. frequency of faculty development activities?

d. funding of faculty development activities and/or centers?

e. planning process for developing faculty development activities?

A significant relationship was found between institution operating budget and: (a) the presence of a faculty development center on campus and (b) the frequency of faculty development activities at the institution. The Pearson Chi-square value for the presence of a faculty development center on campus was 11.042 with df=4 yielding $p=.026$ and was 7.977 with df=2 yielding $p=.019$ for the frequency of faculty development activities. Visual inspection of contingency tables revealed more faculty development centers and more frequent faculty development activities on the campus of institutions having larger institutional operating budgets.

A significant relationship was also found between academic division status and: (a) staffing of faculty development centers on campus and (b) planning process for developing faculty development activities. The Pearson Chi-square value for the staffing of faculty development centers was 11.228 with df=4 yielding $p=.024$ and was 7.688 with df=2 yielding $p=.021$ for the planning process for developing faculty development activities. Visual inspection of contingency tables revealed more faculty development

centers staffed with full time employees in larger division status institutions. Also, there was more administration input into the development of faculty development activities in smaller division status institutions.

Research Question 6: How do U. S. institutions of higher education measure effectiveness of faculty development activities?

A number of institutions utilized more than one procedure to measure effectiveness of faculty development activities (see Table 5 for percentages). The average per institution was 1.5. The total institutional tabulations are as follows: (a) faculty assessment at closure of the activity(s) (78), (b) administrative assessment (55), (c) student assessment (20), and (d) private consultant assessment (9). No institution reported contacting the surrounding community as an assessment base.

Table 5

U. S. Higher Education Evaluation of Effectiveness of Faculty Development Efforts

Evaluation Procedures	Institutions (N=116)	Percent
Faculty assessment at closure of activity(s)	78	68
Administrative assessment	55	48
Student assessment	20	17
Private consultant	9	8
Surrounding community	0	0

Research Question 7: What methods are used by U. S. institutions of higher education to finance faculty development activities?

Responding institutions reported that the most frequent source of funding for faculty development activities came a line item in the university budgets (50) (see Table 6 for percentages). Other revenue sources included college/division/department enhancement funds (20), institutional foundations (13), private sector grants (11), private contributions (10), state grants (7), and public/non-profit grants (5).

Table 6

U. S. Higher Education Faculty Development Funding

Funding Sources	Institution (N=116)	Percent
University budget	50	43
College/division/department enhancement funds	20	17
Institutional foundation	13	11
Private sector grants	11	10
Private contributions	10	8
State grants	7	6
Public/non-profit grants	5	4

Summary and Recommendations

Research has been conducted on the importance of higher education faculty development in many areas needing improvement. Many colleges and universities are

presently exploring strategies for establishing efficient and productive faculty professional development activities.

As the mission of higher education institutions changes, so must the direction of: (a) curriculum, (b) program delivery, (c) instructional delivery, and (d) evaluation of effectiveness. Faculty development is the vehicle by which higher education faculty may continually improve their efforts toward achieving the desired outcomes stated in their institution's mission and objectives. Research on higher education has linked change to faculty development. Further, the research specifies that faculty development should (a) be sustained over time, (b) emphasize substantive, institutional-related issues, (c) utilize internal expertise, (d) involve faculty as active participants in development, (e) emphasize the "why" as well as the "how" of instruction, and (f) articulate a theoretical research base. Those involved with organizing higher education faculty development should anticipate that lasting change will be a slow process. Eight characteristics of effective faculty development center around continuous involvement of faculty as participants with development efforts featuring the active solving of real life higher education problems.

Most U. S. institutions of higher education have adopted some type of faculty development initiative to address the enhancement of institutional effectiveness. In fact, most institutions have adopted a variety of activities addressing a number of issues faculty development issues. Funding for these activities comes from numerous sources with the institution's general budget the most common source. The faculty development activity reported most frequently by U. S. higher education institutions was that of inviting a guest consultant/lecturer to address a single institutional issue with voluntary faculty attendance.

The least used faculty development initiatives were organized around required faculty attendance. The most frequently addressed faculty development topic was technology enhancement. Faculty assessment after a specific developmental initiative was the most often reported procedure for evaluation of the effectiveness of faculty professional development activities. A faculty committee was the most reportedly used process for institutions to decide on appropriate on-campus activities for faculty development.

One-third of the responding institutions utilizing faculty development centers (16) funded a full time instructional center to assist faculty members with development. Another 29% (14) funded part time instructional centers. Ten percent of the faculty development center respondents (5) utilized master teachers or curriculum specialists to assist with development of faculty members.

There were statistically significant associations between the institutions' operating budget and the presence of: (a) a faculty development center on campus, and (b) the frequency of faculty development activities at the institution. More faculty development centers and more faculty development activities occurred in institutions with larger operating budgets.

Statistically significant associations were also found between academic division status and (a) the staffing of faculty development centers on campus, and (b) the planning process for faculty development activities. There were more faculty development centers staffed with full-time employees in larger academic division institutions, and more administration input into faculty development activities within smaller academic division institutions.

In the future, efforts should be made toward the development of measures to gain information related to actual evaluation of faculty development programs used in the process of enhancing faculty productivity, thereby increasing the effectiveness of institutional efforts toward meeting stated mission goals and objectives. Thus, a more comprehensive view of the relationship between institutional effectiveness, instructional efficiency, and faculty productivity can be seen.

REFERENCES

Association for Institutional Research. (1994). Association for institutional research for management, research, policy analysis, and planning: Directory of members Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University.

Baxter, J. (1996). Diversity and the quality process: Curriculum reform in the school and the university. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (48th, Chicago, IL, February 21-24, 1996). (ERIC document number ED 393 825)

Borko, H., & Putnam, R. (1995). Expanding a teacher's knowledge base: A cognitive psychological perspective on professional development. Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices, edited by T. R. Guskey and M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.

Broader, J. & Dorfman J. (1994). Determinants of teaching quality: What's important to students? Research in Higher Education 35(2), 235-250.

Chan, S., & Burton, J. (1993). Faculty vitality in the comprehensive university: Changing context and concerns. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research (33rd, Chicago, IL, May 16-19, 1993). (ERIC document number ED 360 939)

Checkoway, M. (1996). Alternative approaches to educating for diversity: The Madonna university model. Paper presentation for the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (48th, Chicago, IL, February 21-24, 1996). (ERIC document number ED 394 927)

Clark, C., & Lynch, J. (1992). The mixed age college classroom. College Teaching 40(3), 114-117.

Cooper, P., and Hensley, O. (1993a). Faculty perceptions of measures of activity and productivity. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (33rd, Chicago, IL, May 16-19, 1993).

Cooper, P., and Hensley O. (1993b). Faculty productivity reporting systems in research universities. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for institutional Research (33rd, Chicago, IL, May 16-17, 1993).

Collinson, V. (1996). What is in a Name? The Transition from Workshops to Staff Development for Sustained School Improvement. Unpublished manuscript.

DeYoung, A. (1985). Assessing "Faculty Productivity" in colleges of education: Penetration of the technical thesis into the status system of academe. Educational Theory 35(4), 411-421.

Elmes-Crahall, J. (1992). Faculty-Undergraduate research collaboration as a response to the tension of twelve-plus hour teaching loads and publishing expectations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).

Eraut, M. (1995). Developing professional knowledge within a client-centered orientation. Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices, edited by T. R. Guskey and M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ewell, P. (1995) Some sample statistical indicators for evaluating academic programs. Consulting Report: Some Directions for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Reporting at Northwestern State University. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. (1992). Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers. NCRTL Special Report. East Lansing: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC document number ED 346 091)

Fenton, J. (1990). Faculty professional development programs. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC. (ERIC document number ED 321 657)

Fitzgerald, M., & Olsen, H. (1992). The educational uses of information technology: Some minority concerns. Educom Review 27(2), 38-42.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Garland, K., & Rike G. (1987). Scholarly productivity of faculty at ALA-accredited programs of library and information science. Higher Education 28(2), 87-98.

Geuder, M. (1993). Lessons learned. Currents 19(1), 36-39.

Grossman, P. (1992). Teaching to learn. The Changing Contexts of Teaching, edited by A. Lieberman. (91st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gullatt, D., & Weaver, S. (1996). A national perspective of faculty productivity. National Issues in Higher Education: Thirteenth Annual Academic Chairpersons Conference. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Guskey, T. (1995). Professional development in education: In search of optimal mix. Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices, edited by T. R. Guskey and M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hawley, W., & Valli, L. (1996). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. Professional Development Newsletter: Human Recourse Development Program. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Heydinger, R., & Simsek, H. (1992). An agenda for reshaping faculty productivity: State policy and college learning. Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO. State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

Huberman, M. (1995). Professional careers and professional development: Some intersections. In Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices, edited by T. R. Guskey and M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jacobson, R. (1992a). Colleges face new pressure to increase faculty productivity. Chronicle of Higher Education 38(1), 16-18.

Jacobson, R. (1992b). Public college officials struggle to respond to growing concern over faculty productivity. Chronicle of Higher Education 39(12), 17-18.

Jacobsen, R. (1993). What is good testing? Some perception of college students. College Teaching 41(4), 153-156.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal. 2nd ed. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Kaplan, E., & Kies, D. (1993). Together: Teaching styles and learning styles improving college instruction. College Student Journal (27), 509-513.

Katula, R., & Doody, A. (1990). The collegiality model: An alternative for evaluation faculty productivity. ACA Bulletin (74), 74-82, October 1990.

Konrad, A. (1991). Faculty productivity and demographics. Thought and Action 7(2), 19-54.

Lawler, P. (1982). Why qualify faculty performance? Improving College and University Teaching (30), 53-55.

Lawrence, J., & Blackburn, R. (1988). Age as a predictor of faculty productivity: Three conceptual approaches. Journal of Higher Education 59(1), 22-38.

Lisensky, R. (1994). Faculty workload and productivity. NCHEMS Status Report. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS.

Lisensky, R. and Ewell, P. (1988). Assessing institutional effectiveness. Denver, CO. NCHEMS Management Services, Inc.

Little, J. (1986). Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Rethinking school improvement (pp. 26-44). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. (1993). Teacher' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 15(2), 129-151.

Lowman, J. (1994). Professors as performers and motivators. College Teaching 42 (4), 137-141.

Maryland State Council on Vocational-Technical Education. (1991). Strands of opportunity, webs of hope: Weaving a seamless education system for workplace needs. 1991 Annual Report. Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Council on Vocational-Technical Education.

McGuire, J. (1993). Part-time faculty: Partners in excellence. Leadership Abstracts 6(6), 72-73.

McLaughlin, M. (1991). Enabling professional development: What have we learned? In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development for education in the 90s: New demands, new realities, new perspectives (pp. 61-83). New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, B., Lord, B., & Dorney, J. (1994). Summary report: Staff development for teachers: A study of configurations and costs in four districts. Newton, MS: Education Development Center.

Osgood, A., & York, P. (1992). Faculty teacher training at the post-secondary level. (ERIC document number ED 362 511)

Roever, J. (1990). Faculty development, faculty evaluation, and faculty productivity: An administrator's perspective. ACA Bulletin 74, 69-73.

Smylie, M. (1995). Teacher learning in the workplace: Implications for school reform. In Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices, edited by T. Guskey and M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1996). The 1996 SREB Legislative Briefing. Atlanta, GA: SREB.

SYSTAT. (1990). MYSTAT: An instructional version of SYSTAT for IBM-PC/compatibles. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT.

Tillema, H., & Imants, J. (1995). Training for the professional development of teachers. In Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices, edited by T. Guskey and M. Huberman. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wallace, D. (1990). The most productive faculty. Library Journal 115(8), 61-63.

Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board. (1993). Planning for distance education and supporting policies: A work plan. Olympia, WA: Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board (ERIC document number ED 368 329)

Weinstein, C., & Meyer, D. (1991). Cognitive learning strategies and college teaching. In R. J. Meneges & M. D. Svinicki (Eds.) College Teaching: From Theory to Practice (pp. 15-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wilcox, J., & Ebbs, S. (1992) The leadership compass: Values and ethics in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports: Report One. Washington, DC: George Washington University.